

## Courts could work harder, smarter with judicial information network

By Chief Justice Elizabeth A. Weaver

**T**he judiciary faces a long-standing critical need:

*The creation of a judicial information system network that will allow courts, executive branch departments and the Legislature to communicate with one another and share data.*

---

Judicial Information  
System Advisory  
Commission members,  
**see page 2**

---

Our collective effort to improve trial courts and work more efficiently and productively with the other branches of government, state and local, cannot be complete without the technology that gives rise to these possibilities.

Electronic communications networks are today's equivalent of the light bulb and the telephone. It is increasingly difficult to explain to the public how it can be that, as we enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century, a court sentencing a man for, say, reckless driving does not know whether the man has drunk driving charges pending in another court. In an age where the transmission of data can occur literally with a single keystroke, where 10-year-olds are downloading data for school reports and grandmothers are doing their Christmas shopping on the Internet, we still have courts entering data by hand; and transferring conviction data by hard copy to the Secretary of State, the State Police, and the Department of Corrections. We cannot hope to continue to work harder and smarter if we don't have

*See COURTS, page 2*



**The Michigan  
Supreme Court's  
goals for the  
judiciary:**

*Fairness  
Accessibility  
Accountability  
Effectiveness  
Responsiveness  
Independence*

### Inside This Issue

Justice Young offers insights into judicial philosophy	3
Legislative Update	4
Changeover	4
Public perceptions of jury service analyzed by high court survey	5
Fine Point — MJJ leads the way with CD-i technology	6
Best Practices — District court develops coordinated services network	7
Administrative Update	10
Grant Update	13
Court Calendar	14

## Courts could work harder, smarter with judicial information network

(Continued from page 1)

access to the technology that tells all parts of the system what we need to know to do our jobs.

Effective law enforcement demands that the State Police, the Department of Corrections, and the trial courts communicate data in real time with standard data elements. The Secretary of State needs timely, accurate data about convictions in order to revoke and suspend licenses. The Supreme Court and the State Court Administrative Office need accurate, timely and detailed data about caseloads in each court in order to evaluate court performance and needs. The Legislature needs this information in order to evaluate and understand the Supreme Court's recommendations concerning jurisdiction changes and judgeships. This is a public safety issue. It is a public confidence issue. It is a good government issue. It is an urgent need.

The Supreme Court's budget request to the Executive and Legislature contains this message. Our recommendation was the product of the work of our Judicial Information System Advisory Commission, consisting of representatives from the judiciary, local government, the State Police, Department of Management and Budget, Secretary of State, Treasury, and the Legislature. Drawing on the lessons learned from the start-up of other major networks, the Supreme Court proposed that the judiciary use the Department of Management and Budget as our telecommunications provider, and that the network be built using existing local infrastructure. The Court proposed to pay for the cost of this system through modest increases in some of the fees collected within the courts themselves. If the Legislature or Executive have other ways to fund this project, we will gladly accept them.

Although funding for the judicial information network is, as of this writing, not a part of the proposed budget for the judiciary, we are continuing to work closely with the Legislature and the Executive branch in order to assure that this need will be met in the most cost-effective manner.

### Michigan Supreme Court REPORT

*Michigan Supreme Court Report* is published by the Michigan Supreme Court.

#### Chief Justice

Elizabeth A. Weaver

#### Justices

James H. Brickley  
Michael F. Cavanagh  
Marilyn Kelly  
Clifford W. Taylor  
Maura D. Corrigan  
Robert P. Young, Jr.

#### Director, Office of Chief Justice

Nkrumah Johnson-Wynn

#### Supreme Court Counsel

Janet Welch

#### State Court Administrator

John D. Ferry, Jr.

#### Public Information Officer

David Gruber  
Michigan Supreme Court  
PO Box 30052  
Lansing, MI 48933  
Phone: 517/373-0129

#### Publications Coordinator

Ann Tschirhart

#### Administrative Assistant

Linda Clewley

For information regarding changes of address or employment opportunities, contact Brenda Underwood, SCAO, at 517/373-9231.

### JISAC Commission Members

The Michigan Supreme Court thanks the members of the Judicial Information System Advisory Commission for their contributions to this project.

- Chairperson, Chief Justice Michigan Supreme Court
- Hon. Edward Avadenka, Judge 48th District Court Bloomfield Hills
- Hon. Marianne Battani, Judge 3rd Circuit Court, Wayne County
- Hon. Michael Baumgartner Judge, 3rd Circuit Court Roscommon County
- Ms. Donna Beaudet Court Administrator 46th District Court, Southfield
- Mr. George Boersma CIO, State of Michigan
- Mr. Dave Cable Court Administrator 10th Circuit Court Saginaw County
- Lt. Col. Steve DeBoer Deputy Director, Support Services, Michigan State Police
- Hon. A. T. Frank, Representative Michigan House, 96th District
- Hon. Terry Geiger Representative Michigan House, 87th District
- Mr. Paul M. Hunt Vice Provost & CIO Michigan State University
- Mr. Mark Jasonowicz Deputy Director Family Independence Agency
- Mr. Mike Keeler Friend of the Court Barry County
- Hon. John Kirkendall Judge, Washtenaw County Probate Court
- Hon. Terri Land County Clerk, Kent County
- Ms. Phyllis Mellon Director, Policy & Planning Department of State
- Hon. Mickey Mortimer County Clerk, Jackson County
- Hon. Janet Neff, Judge Michigan Court of Appeals
- Hon. Richard Pajtas, Judge 33rd Circuit Court Charlevoix County
- Hon. Gary Peters, Senator Michigan Senate, 14th District
- Mr. Jim Pulliam Director, Information Systems Berrien County
- Hon. William Rush Judge, 76th District Court Isabella County
- Mr. Jeffrey Sauter Prosecuting Attorney Eaton County
- Mr. William Sederburg, President Ferris State University
- Ms. Susan Unger CIO, Chrysler Corporation
- Hon. William Van Regenmorter Senator, Michigan Senate 22nd District
- Mr. Walter Wisniewski Deputy Director Administrative Services Michigan Treasury Department

---

## Special Events

# Justice Young offers insights into his judicial philosophy

*The following are excerpts from remarks delivered by Justice Robert P. Young, Jr., during his investiture ceremony on February 18, 1999. The ceremony was held at The Gem Theatre in Detroit.*

For the more than 20 years of my practice, I have been a “consumer” of the decisions of the Supreme Court. For most of that time, the Court seems to have been less than conscious that its decisions had to be applied by we mere mortals, by trial judges, lawyers, their clients and the public at large so that we could organize and plan our lives with a clear understanding of and in conformity with the law. I decided to see whether frankly I could make a difference.

I have “arrived” so to speak. After only six weeks as a justice, I am even more acutely aware of the awesome responsibility of my office and more respectful of how hard it is to simply get it “right”. We are, my six colleagues and I, literally custodians of the law. What we do or fail to do has far reaching implications, not only for the individual parties whose cases we hear, but for everyone in the State. Our decisions are the final word and largely unreviewable. Unquestionably, we must ensure that the law is applied equally, without respect to who a particular person is but the merit of her cause. And we must similarly ensure that the constitutional liberties we have enshrined in our state and federal constitutions are enforced and vigorously protected.

I am concerned that over a period of time the public has come to regard the judiciary as merely another political arena, an alternate forum in which to make public policy. However, our constitution assigns each of the three branches of government specific responsibilities, and each branch must jealously guard the boundaries that separate them. While the judiciary provides an important check on unconstitutional actions by the other two branches of government, I do not believe that the judiciary is an auxiliary legislature, nor is the judiciary free to intervene in public policy decisions of the political branches and remake them.

Thus, my judicial philosophy acknowledges that, in matters of social and political policy, no judge or court is smarter than the people and their elected representatives of the executive and legislative branches. The people of Michigan have chosen to be governed by our state constitution, and I do not believe that the judiciary, no matter how well intentioned, should contravene that written expression of the people’s will.

Similarly, our statutes represent the will of the people, as expressed through our elected representatives. Courts must be careful to avoid nullifying that will unless the legislation at issue is plainly unconstitutional.

As a result, my judicial philosophy requires that I:

- give deference to the political branches of government (the legislative and executive branches) by avoiding policy-making in the guise of deciding cases, and by interpreting the constitution and statutes consistent with the plain meaning of their language;
- consider the impact of my decisions beyond the case at hand;
- craft decisions with concern for the ease with which they can be applied; and
- decide cases on the narrowest basis possible in order to reduce the incidence of adverse collateral and unintended consequences.

In closing, let me honestly say that I have never held a more difficult position, nor one that I desired to succeed at more. I need and ask for your prayers. I pledge to you that I will be the best Supreme Court Justice that, by dedication, energy and honest commitment, I can be. Thank you for your warm reception.

## Legislative Update

### Readers please note:

*The descriptions provided in the legislative summary are the official legislative digest descriptions prepared at the bill's introduction, and may not reflect the content of the legislation as finally enacted. Readers should consult the text of the act for the actual language.*

**PA 137 (SB 209)** — Effective: 4/1/00  
MCL 168.799a, 168.803, 168.933  
*Sponsor: Sen. W. Van Regenmorter*  
Probate: Wills and estates; probate code revision; enact new “estates and protected individuals code” and repeal “revised probate code”.

**PA 415 (SB 752)** — Effective: 1/1/99  
MCL 730.523.a  
*Sponsor: Sen. J. Young Jr.*  
Courts; Municipal court; appeals from municipal courts; revise.

**PA 434 (HB 5708)** — Effective: 12/30/98  
MCL 566.11-566.23, 566.31-566.43  
*Sponsor: Rep. A. Richner*  
Torts; Property interests; uniform fraudulent transfer act; conform to latest version of uniform act.

**PA 474 (HB 5564)** — Effective:  
MCL 710.21, 712A.2, 712A.2a, 212A.2c, 712A.14, .15, .18, .25, .26  
*Sponsor: Rep. J. Scranton*  
Civil Procedure; Personal protection orders; personal protection orders in domestic violence and stalking cases; allow family division of probate court to issue.

**PA 475 (HB 5567)** — Effective: 3/1/99  
MCL 764.15b,c  
*Sponsor: Rep. K. Kilpatrick*  
Civil Procedure; Injunctions; warrantless arrest provisions for violation of personal protection orders; amend to make consistent with revised judiciary acts.

**PA 476 (SB 866)** — Effective: 3/1/99  
MCL 600.2950a  
*Sponsor: Sen. W. Van Regenmorter*  
Civil Procedure; Personal protection orders; personal protection orders in domestic violence and stalking cases; allow family division of circuit court to issue.

**PA 477 (SB 874)** — Effective: 3/1/99  
MCL \_\_\_\_\_  
*Sponsor: Sen. A. Smith*  
Civil Procedure; Personal protection orders; personal protection orders in domestic violence and stalking cases; allow family division of circuit court to issue.

**PA 551 (SB 841)** — Effective: 3/1/99  
MCL \_\_\_\_\_  
*Sponsor: Sen. R. Geake*  
Family Law; Friend of the court; citizen advisory committee; mandate friend of the court to provide with certain records and information and create penalties for violations of confidentiality.

**PA 389 (HB 4044)** — Effective: 11/30/98  
MCL 600.2965, 600.2966, 600.2967  
*Sponsor: Rep. K. Profit*  
Torts; liability; “firefighter’s rule”; abolish common law rule and reestablish statutorily with modification.

**PA 407 (HB 5271)** — Effective: 1/1/99  
MCL 770.2, 770.3  
*Sponsor: Rep. W. Callahan*  
Courts; Municipal court; appeals from municipal court in criminal cases; revise.

## Changeover

### APPOINTMENTS:

**Voet, Raymond**, appointed to District 64A, Ionia County, effective 3/8/99 to succeed David Hoort, elected to circuit court.

**Brown, Archie Cameron**, from 15th District, Washtenaw County, was appointed to the 22nd Circuit Court to succeed Kurtis Wilder. The effective date is 3/29/99.

**Goodridge, Julie Creal**, was appointed to 15th District, Washtenaw County, to succeed Judge Brown. The effective date is 3/29/99.

### DEATHS:

**Smith, Richard G.**, retired 18th Circuit Court Judge, passed away 12/4/98. Judge Smith served the 18th Circuit from 1957-1964.

**Martin, Rex B.**, retired 39th Circuit Court Judge, passed away 12/21/98. Judge Martin served the 39th Circuit from 1953-1982.

# Public perceptions of jury service analyzed by high court survey

*Anne M. Vrooman, Director of Local Intergovernmental Relations*

**M**ost Michigan residents strongly support the concept of jury service, but a majority also believe the courts treat the rich better than the poor and the famous better than average citizens, according to a recent survey conducted for the Michigan Supreme Court.

The Court, along with the State Court Administrative Office, commissioned the public attitude survey in December 1998 as part of their effort to improve the jury management system. The survey was conducted by Public Sector Consultants, Inc., of Lansing.

A sample of 800 Michigan residents participated in the telephone survey. The 30 question survey was designed to gather information from the public about their perceptions of jury service, both from those who have served as jurors and those who have not. The survey results are intended to provide greater understanding of barriers to jury service, and be an important source of information as efforts to improve the jury management system continue at both the state and local level.

### Major findings

- The concept of jury service enjoys strong support among Michigan residents. At least 80 percent of the respondents agree that they have a direct say in bringing about justice on a jury, trial by jury is the best way to ensure justice, they would be proud to serve on a jury, jury service is one of the most important civic obligations, and judges and court staff would appreciate their jury service.
- **Enthusiasm for the concept of jury service is tempered by Michiganian's perception of the actual process of jury service.** A majority of the respondents agree that courts do not treat regular people as well as they do the famous (77 percent) and do not treat the poor as well as the rich (65 percent). Other faults of the jury sys-

tem are uncovered based on the respondent's region of residence, age, and especially race. Responses from respondents with higher levels of education and higher levels of income indicate that they are generally more comfortable with the jury system and process of jury service than are respondents with less education and lower incomes.

- **With only two exceptions, answers from respondents who attended a court proceeding as a friend, defendant, plaintiff, witness, juror, or attorney are within 10 percentage points of the responses from people who have never been inside a courtroom for any reason.** The two exceptions are: fear of reprisal (42 percent of respondents who attended a court proceeding are "greatly" or "somewhat" concerned, compared to 60 percent of those who have not attended a court proceeding); and the respondent's belief that s/he knows enough to serve on a jury (79 percent of attendees and 63 percent of nonattendees).
- **For nearly every survey question, responses from people who have never been called for jury duty, people who have been called but never served, and people who have served for jury duty vary by 10 or fewer percentage points.** Personal experience with the jury system, therefore, appears to have little effect on either attitudes or identification barriers.
- **Some of the largest differences in attitudes and barriers identified in the survey, however, are between experienced jurors who would look forward to serving again and those who would not look forward to it.** Experience as a juror seems to polarize attitudes to nearly every question in the survey. Some former jurors reflect on jury service very positively while others view it with disdain;

*See PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS, page 6*



# Michigan Judicial Institute leads the way with CD-i technology

by Vickie Eggers, Distance Learning Specialist  
Michigan Judicial Institute

**T**he Michigan Judicial Institute (MJi) received the 1998 National Association for Court Management Justice Achievement Award for the development of a CD-interactive disc titled *I'm Sorry, I Can't Give Legal Advice* — a training tool for court support personnel who must provide top-quality customer service without offering legal advice.

## Selecting CD-i technology

This first venture into CD-interactive was the result of efforts by the MJi and Michigan Court Support Personnel Training Consortium (Consortium). In the past, attempts had been made by individual courts to provide training for their court support staff. This approach, however, was found to be fragmented and inefficient. Because the courts faced

many of the same issues, there was a need for uniform training on a statewide basis. To identify the training and delivery needs for Michigan's front line court staff, the Consortium was formed.

The overall objectives of statewide training included: development of cost-effective and flexible methods for statewide training; delivery of training in a timely and consistent manner; and increased capacity for courts to provide training at the local court level.

With more than 9,000 court employees in Michigan an alternative to face-to-face training was needed. The Consortium began to search for a distance learning medium that could deliver top-quality training and meet the proposed objectives effectively. After reviewing

*See MICHIGAN JUDICIAL, page 9*

---

## Public perceptions of jury service analyzed by high court

*(Continued from page 5)*

familiarity with the jury system breeds the extremes of confidence and contempt. Further study will be necessary to understand why each group responds the way it does.

- **Information about barriers to service is mixed.** Race appears to affect substantially respondents' perception of the jury and justice system - but not perceptions of financial or other barriers to jury service or personal experience of barriers through serving on a jury. When analyzed by the respondent's level of education, however, financial barriers to jury service are substantial — only the most educated and most wealthy respondents believe they will receive their current salary during jury service.

The jury study was conducted in a manner which allows the responses to be analyzed according to specific demo-

graphics such as region of the state, age, gender, race, income, and education level. Further analysis of the results will be conducted at a more detailed level.

A copy of the survey and results will be distributed to each chief judge. Chief judges should provide copies to other members of their bench and court administrator, and are encouraged to share the information with members of the local bar, prosecutors, funding units, court clerks, and others with an interest in efforts to improve the jury management system.

---

*Courts that would like to conduct further analysis of responses applicable to their area, or are interested in developing a local initiative related to jury management improvement should contact Anne Vrooman. PH: 517/373-0128.*

# District court develops network to provide coordinated services

By Margie Good, Management Analyst  
State Court Administrative Office

In an effort to develop effective criminal justice programs that meet the needs of court users and the local community, the 52-1 District Court judges and staff have coordinated a local network that links the court with other local criminal justice agencies and treatment providers. By addressing several key performance areas outlined in the Michigan Trial Court Performance Standards and Measurements System, the court has successfully developed two innovative programs. These programs also exemplify the philosophy that encourages trial courts to conduct regular self-assessments and improvements as part of routine court administrative activities, which result in increased public trust and confidence in the courts and the legal profession.

### Preventing domestic violence — An alliance approach

For the past several years, an alliance of governmental and private groups from Oakland County have worked together to address the issue of domestic assault. The groups include: the 52-1 District Court, HAVEN (a domestic violence prevention organization), Oakland County Pretrial Services, Catholic Social Services men's program, police and prosecutors.

From its inception, the alliance agreed that domestic assault is a crime — not a private family matter. This precept has served as the foundation for all alliance actions. By treating domestic assault as a crime, a defendant's opportunity to obstruct justice is sharply reduced, while the victim serves as a witness who can no longer be pressured or enticed into requesting that the case be dismissed.

As part of a new approach, HAVEN has educated all police officers in the

dynamics of domestic violence. In turn, the police department has agreed to:

- arrest individuals when there is probable cause to believe an assault had occurred;
- hold the defendant for up to 20 hours;
- give the victim information about HAVEN; and
- fax the police report to HAVEN and the court.

The process continues when a representative of HAVEN contacts the victim and may appear with her/him in court. Oakland Pretrial Services has agreed to prepare a pre-bond report prior to the arraignment. The court has agreed to conduct the arraignment within a 24-hour period and to schedule the case on a special fast track docket. The court and prosecutors have agreed to not dismiss any cases — even if requested by the victim — but to resolve these matters either through plea or trial. HAVEN and Catholic Social Services have agreed to provide long-term batterer intervention treatment for convicted defendants. Regular reports of the alliance project are issued to the media and presented to community groups to raise awareness of goals and progress.

The fast track approach adopted by the court has advanced 2,003 cases through the criminal justice system in less time than before. The time between arraignment and pretrial (the first court hearing) dropped from an average of 40 days down to 5 days. The time between arraignment and trial dropped from an average of 113 days down to 13 days. The goal of ending dismissals at the victim's request, which occurred in approximately 30% of cases in 1992, was achieved. The current conviction rate of 90% is consistent with other misdemeanor offenses. This occurred without

*See DISTRICT, page 8*

---

## District court develops network to provide coordinated services

(Continued from page 7)

an increase in the number of trials. The recidivism rate for domestic violence offenders in the first four years of the alliance program is 5%.

The 52% decline in the number of felonies bound over to circuit court since 1993 is echoed by the overall decline in the number of domestic violence misdemeanors charged in the 52-1 District Court. The numbers for domestic violence misdemeanors charged in the court since 1995 are as follows: 1995 — 411; 1996 — 454; 1997 — 420; and 1998 — 372.

The number of misdemeanors charged in 1998 reflects a 9.5% decline from 1995 which was the first full year in which all of the communities served by the 52-1 District Court were part of the alliance. It also reflects an 18% decline from the peak year of 1996.

### Town hall meetings

Judges and staff of the 52-1 District Court initiated community support and sponsorship for a series of town hall meetings, held in various locations throughout Oakland County during October of 1998. Assistance in planning the town hall meetings was provided by the Oakland County Prosecutor's Office, Oakland County Community Corrections, the Oakland County Sheriff's Department and the area police chiefs and their staff. In addition, there were national justice system sponsors, as well as state and local community agency, local government, school and business sponsors.

The specific goals of the town hall meetings were to:

- identify strategies for improving the court and the criminal justice system;
- raise the level of awareness of both the court and the general public for the need to work together;
- develop goals rooted in local experience to deal with problems, trends, and issues involving the community and the court;
- and improve public trust and confidence in the criminal justice system.

Citizens interested in improving the court and the legal system were asked to participate in the town hall meetings to discuss ways the community and the court could work together to address issues facing the criminal justice system.

Anonymous questionnaires soliciting input on the effectiveness of the court were widely distributed at the town hall meetings and throughout the community. The majority of the questionnaires returned indicated that the 52-1 District Court was doing a good or excellent job.

The exchange of ideas that took place at the town hall meetings was positive for the court, for the justice system and for the community. The 52-1 District Court learned the following:

- there is a need for improved communication about justice system issues, including sentences, juvenile delinquency and divorce;
- there are limited areas throughout the court house to speak in private;
- the court needs to provide more assistance to those without counsel or who are simply seeking more information; and
- the courtesy and hard work of the court staff is perceived as one of the court's strongest resources.

As a result of the town hall meetings, there is recognition that the court needs to change and grow in a way that makes it more visible, more accessible and more pro-active. The court has made a commitment to hold the town hall meetings each year and has developed strategies to address the issues raised at these meetings.

---

*For information on these programs, you may contact: Hon. Brian W. MacKenzie, 52-1 District Court, 48150 Grand River Ave., Novi, MI 48374-1222.*

*PH: 248/305-6066.*

*E-mail: mackenzieb@co.oakland.mi.us*



---

## Michigan Judicial Institute embraces distance learning

(Continued from page 6)

various technologies including CD-ROM, it was decided that compact disc interactive (CD-i), was the medium of choice. CD-i offered interactive “plug and play” technology that required little technical training and virtually no technical support.

### What is CD-i?

A CD-i looks like a CD-ROM, but each is formatted differently. The CD-i does not require a computer. Rather, it uses a player that looks similar to the VCR players used in most homes. The player simply plugs into a monitor and is ready to be viewed. The initial screen that appears on the monitor shows a “play” button and an “exit” button. Utilizing a remote control (similar to a VCR or TV remote), users may click “play” to display a menu of choices on the monitor screen. By clicking on a menu choice, users may view video segments that explain how to move through the screens and the content areas available. The CD-i can include definitions, guidelines, examples, exercises, scenarios. In addition, it provides immediate feedback to the user. Text, audio, voice-over, graphics and full-motion video segments can be interwoven throughout the content to enhance the training. Interactive links throughout the program allow participants to access other sections of the disc. Upon completion of each segment, users are given questions and possible responses. They are encouraged to click on the response they feel is best, as well as explore the other responses. The CD-i is an excellent training tool because of its ability to interact and instruct at the user’s pace.

### The CD-i development process

Once the decision was made to utilize CD-i, it was then necessary to bring together a committee of content experts to work with a commercial vendor to design an effective training package. By targeting audience profiles, evaluating the performance needs of the staff, listing necessary content topics, and assessing the complexity of each topic, the committee designed a production script. The vendor then utilized the production script to make recommendations regard-

ing use of video, audio, graphics and more. After the committee approved the first written draft for production, an actual “alpha” version of the CD-i was generated for reviewing and testing purposes. When the final version of the CD-i was approved, the project moved forward into production for distribution. This process is utilized for the development of all CD-i projects.

### Use of CD-i by court staff

While the CD-i does require a specialized player, the MJI has made arrangements to install players in courts willing to serve as regional training centers throughout the state. There are presently more than 30 regional CD-i court training centers and with generous funding from the Domestic Violence Treatment & Prevention Board, additional CD-i equipment will be available for every circuit court in the state. In addition, grant funding from the Michigan Justice Training Commission will allow MJI to establish 10 additional regional training centers during this fiscal year.

Court employees who wish to view CD-i titles should contact a regional training center in their area to schedule viewing times. A list of courts with CD-i capabilities is available upon request from MJI and will soon be available on the MJI web site as installation sites are completed.

Available MJI titles in CD-i format include *I’m Sorry, I Can’t Give Legal Advice* and *Your Guide to Accessing Michigan Courts*. CD-i topic areas now in development include: OUIL Repeat Offender Legislation; Michigan Court Rules for court support personnel; and personal protection orders. Currently, the MJI is considering the development of a CD-i covering ethics for court personnel.

---

*For information regarding the MJI’s use of CD-i technology, or to suggest topic areas for CD-i production, contact Vickie Eggers. PH: 517/334-7805. EMAIL: [eggerv@jud.state.mi.us](mailto:eggerv@jud.state.mi.us).*

## ADMINISTRATIVE MAILINGS

The administrative mailings listed here have been sent under separate cover.

**Supreme Court Orders —**  
**97-14, AO 1999-1**, assignment of medical support enforcement matters to the third circuit for discovery purposes; **AO 1999-2**, authorization of additional demonstration project to study court consolidation; appointment of chief judge of the Court of Appeals; **98-26**, amendment of Rule 2.203 of the MCR, joinder of claims, counterclaims, and cross-claims; **98-47**, Joint Local Court Rule 2.119 for the Genesee County Circuit and Probate Courts, Motion Practice; **98-24, 98-10**, In re Proposed Amendment of Rule 7.305 of the MCR, to include tribal courts; **98-53**, amendment to Rule 8.110 of the MCR, chief judge rule, court hours; court holidays; judicial absences.

**Letter from Sandi Hartnell —** regarding process service fees, to be distributed to all chief judges, court administrators, probate registers and county clerks.

**Letter from John Ferry, Jr. —** regarding the 1998 Annual Grievance Report to the Legislature, to be distributed to all friends of the court

**Letter from Department of Treasury —** regarding limitation on noneconomic damages and product liability determination on economic damages.

**Little River Band of Ottawa Indians —** AO 99-0126, Court Rule: Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgements.

**LEIN News Bulletin —** January/February 1999, pages 3-6.

**Central Records Division Bulletin —** 99-1, January 1999.

**Employment opportunities —** director of human resources, 36th district court; technical services representative, SCAO; and programmer analyst (3 positions), SCAO.

## Administrative Update

### Reminder issued in district and municipal court cases

District and municipal court judges, magistrates, court administrators and clerks are reminded that if the court receives a multi-charge citation representing more than one charge, each charge is to be counted on the Caseload Report as a separate case. Law enforcement officers should file a separate copy of the citation for each charge represented; each copy serves as a complaint and notice of hearing for the charge represented on that copy. Each court should implement a method by which each alleged violation bears a unique case or citation number to facilitate accurate counting of the separate charges. The court may file one or more of these violations from the same incident in the same case file.

### Employment notices to be sent electronically

The SCAO has been including copies of employment notices in each set of enclosures for this newsletter. Beginning immediately, the SCAO will electronically transmit these notices to the courts. Courts with vacancies should e-mail employment postings to Brenda Underwood at [underwoodb@jud.state.mi.us](mailto:underwoodb@jud.state.mi.us). Postings should include your court's contact person and phone number.

These postings will be e-mailed to all chief judge Voyager accounts. Courtesy copies will be e-mailed to court administrators with e-mail addresses on file with SCAO.

### Annual judicial conferences scheduled for summer

The 1999 annual conference for district and municipal court judges will be held July 12-14, at Shanty Creek Resort in Bellaire. The annual conference for circuit, court of appeals and probate court judges will be held August 16-18, at the Amway Grand Plaza Hotel in Grand Rapids. Each conference will begin at noon on Monday with a luncheon meeting with SCAO regional administrators.

### Deadline passes for court employee survey

The deadline for return of the 1999 Court Employee Compensation Survey and Court Employee Demographics Survey questionnaires was February 5. If you have not returned the questionnaires, please do so as soon as possible. Prompt return of the questionnaires is necessary to ensure timely publication of the survey information. If you have any questions regarding the surveys or if you did not receive a survey questionnaire, call the SCAO-Human Resources Division. PH: 517/373-9525.

### CIP offers grant funding for family division initiatives

The Court Improvement Project (CIP) will accept applications for mini-grants until March 31. These grants, ranging from \$2,000-\$5,000, will be awarded by SCAO for court-initiated, collaborative projects that improve how the family division processes child protective proceedings. Larger amounts will be considered for regional efforts or for projects with a substantial positive impact on a local child welfare system. All chief circuit, chief probate and presiding family division judges received a complete information packet in February. Suggestions for mini-grants include: local training for attorneys, court staff and/or case managers; supplies to refurbish a waiting area to make it more child or family friendly; or collaborative meetings with child welfare partners on key local issues relative to child protection.

For information, contact Linda Glover, SCAO-Central. PH: 517/373-8651.

## Administrative Update

### Verification process underway for 1998 caseload data

Each chief judge has been sent a compilation of their courts 1998 caseload data for review and verification. This information, which is used for many issues facing the judiciary, will be published in the Michigan State Courts Annual Report 1998. It is essential that the data are correct. For information, contact Marge Bossenbery, SCAO-Central. PH: 517/373-0382.

### MJI schedules orientation for PPO training facilitators

The program is intended for court staff who handle PPO actions and need training to properly assist unrepresented parties without giving legal advice. The MJI is preparing an interactive program on compact disc-interactive (CD-i) that will follow the stages of a hypothetical personal protection action from its initiation through an enforcement proceeding after an alleged violation of the court's order.

At each stage of the action, participants will obtain information about the law as it affects their duties, appropriate responses to the parties' requests for assistance, and techniques for managing emotionally charged situations.

Courts desiring to take part in this training program will receive a CD-i program disc, a reproducible participant workbook and the equipment necessary to view the CD-i program. Each participating court will be asked to designate a training facilitator who will lead at least two hours of training sessions with its staff. Approximately 90 minutes will involve viewing the CD-i program; the remaining 30 minutes will consist of a follow-up training session held at least 30 days after completing the initial training, where the training facilitator will have the opportunity to reinforce material presented in the initial session and discuss questions that have arisen about this material.

To assist the designated training facilitators, the MJI has scheduled two orientation sessions. Facilitators may choose to attend one of the following sessions: May 13, from 1:00-5:00 p.m. at the MJI Court Administrators Specialty Seminar, Holiday Inn, Big Rapids; or June 24, from 9:30 a.m.-3:30 p.m. at the Grayling Holiday Inn.

At these sessions, facilitators will become familiar with the CD-i program and with general techniques for leading CD-i training sessions. Participants will also receive a facilitator's guide and a plan for follow-up reinforcement sessions with staff.

Information packets about MJI's PPO training program and registration forms were sent in February to chief judges, county clerks and court administrators in courts that handle PPO actions. Registration forms for the Big Rapids facilitator orientation session must be returned to MJI by April 1; registration forms for the Grayling session are due May 1. For information, contact Mary Lovik, MJI: PH: 517/334-8998. EMAIL: lovikm@jud.state.mi.us.

Participants at the MJI Regional Judicial Seminars will also have an opportunity to view demonstrations of this and other MJI CD-i training programs. These seminars will be held: March 29-30 (Grand Rapids); April 27-28 (Traverse City); and June 15-16 (Lansing).

*Funding for this project is provided under grant number 97-WF-NX-0016, awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, and administered by the Michigan Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment Board.*

## ADMINISTRATIVE MAILINGS

The items listed here have been sent under separate cover since the previous issue of the *Michigan Supreme Court Report*.

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** SCAO Form 41, FOC Statistical Report, e-mailed to all chief circuit court judges, 1/27/99

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** JISAC Final Report & Recommendations, mailed to all chief judges and court administrators, 1/28/99

**From Gov. John Engler, Chief Justice Elizabeth A. Weaver and John D. Ferry, Jr. —** Administrative policy memo 1999-01; Batterer intervention standards, mailed to all chief judges, 1/29/99

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** Change in format of jury source list from Sec'y of State, mailed to chief judges, cc: court administrators and county clerks, 1/29/99

**From Douglas A. Van Epps —** MSC Dispute Resolution Task Force Report; mailed to chief judges, 1/29/99

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** CIP mini-grants, mailed to chief circuit, probate & presiding family division judges, cc: memo only to circuit, probate & family division court administrators, 2/2/99

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** letters from Chief Justice Weaver: dated 1/25/99, regarding tribute to Lt. Governor Connie Binsfeld; dated 2/2/99, regarding judicial pay raises and judicial pay raises schedule; mailed to all judges and justices, 2/3/99

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** 1999 Judicial Salaries; mailed to all funding units, 2/4/99

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** Grant funding opportunity for courts: e-mailed to chief judges and court administrators, 2/5/99

**From Sharon K. Deja —** unemployed non-custodial parent program policy changes; mailed to all friends of the court, 2/22/99

**From John D. Ferry, Jr. —** Admin. Memo 1999-02, guidelines for unscheduled court closing due to weather emergency; guidelines for court staff hours Local Admin. Orders (MSC AO 1998-05), e-mailed to all chief judges, court administrators, probate registers, and FOCs 2/23/99

## Administrative Update

### Address Corrections

All court staff should forward address and phone number corrections to:

Brenda Underwood  
SCAO  
PO Box 30048  
Lansing, MI 48909

[underwoodb@jud.state.mi.us](mailto:underwoodb@jud.state.mi.us)

### Legislature clarifies laws involving juveniles, PPOs

The Michigan legislature passed a series of bills designed to clarify PPO laws and their impact on juveniles during December, 1998. Public Acts 474, 474, 476 and 477, which went into effect March 1, address these issues pertaining to juveniles.

- circuit court, family division jurisdiction for PPOs.
- clarification of Juvenile Code jurisdiction over minors as it relates to the appointment of a guardian ad litem for a petitioner, as well as penalties that a minor defendant can be subject to if there is a violation of a PPO.
- issuance of a PPO in a parent/child relationship. (Prohibits court from issuing a PPO if the petitioner is the unemancipated minor child of a respondent [parent] or, if the respondent is a unemancipated minor child of a parent petitioner).
- requirement that penalties for PPO violation under juvenile code must appear in the order.
- requirement that a PPO involving a minor respondent must be served on the respondent as well as his/her parents, guardians or custodians.
- allowance of law enforcement to take a minor defendant into custody without a court order if there is or has been a violation of a PPO.
- requirement of finding that a PPO has been violated before any dispositional alternatives identified in the juvenile code can be imposed on a juvenile defendant.

### Grant-Related Web Sites

The following web sites are being provided for grant and technical assistance information:

- **Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**  
[www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm](http://www.ncjrs.org/ojjhome.htm)
- **National Criminal Justice Reference Service**  
[www.ncjrs.org](http://www.ncjrs.org)
- **Drug Courts Program Office**  
[www.ojp.usdoj.gov/dcpo](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/dcpo)
- **National Association of Drug Court Professionals**  
[www.drugcourt.org](http://www.drugcourt.org)
- **National Center for State Courts**  
[www.ncsc.dni.us/wash\\_dc/gov\\_rel.htm](http://www.ncsc.dni.us/wash_dc/gov_rel.htm)
- **Center on Crime, Communities and Culture**  
[www.soros.org/crime/](http://www.soros.org/crime/)



## Grant Update

**Office of Drug Control Policy (ODCP) Byrne Memorial Formula Grants:** Program purpose areas for grant funding cover four topics: Prevention, including community policing strategies, juvenile intervention strategies, family and domestic violence strategies, gang task force strategies and DARE; Rehabilitation, including rehabilitation of juveniles and adults; Incarceration, including multijurisdictional task forces, money laundering task forces and prosecution; and Drug Control Programs Evaluation. Courts are eligible to apply for grants in the following areas: juvenile intervention strategies; family and domestic violence strategies; and rehabilitation of juveniles and adults. The match requirement for new projects is 25% except for incarceration programs which are 50%. The match requirement for continuing projects is 40% except for DARE, which is 25%. To request a grant application and guideline kit contact the ODCP. PH: 517/373-4700. **The SCAO will continue to coordinate the judicial grant application process. Applications (original and 4 white copies) should be submitted to the SCAO-Central by Thursday, April 1.** This will allow time for preparation of summaries of the projects and a letter from the Chief Justice for submission with the applications to the ODCP by 5:00 p.m., Friday, April 9. For information, contact Margie Good, SCAO-Central. PH: 517/373-5596. Or contact the ODCP, Lewis Cass Bldg., 2nd Floor, 320 S. Walnut St., Lansing, MI 48913. PH: 517/373-4700.

**Kmart Family Foundation:** The Kmart Family Foundation is providing funding for drug abuse prevention programs in Kmart communities. For information, contact: Kmart Family Foundation, Kmart Corporate Affairs, 3100 W. Big Beaver Rd., Troy, MI 48084.

**Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP):** \$11.9 million is available from the Drug-Free Communities Support Program for matching grants of up to \$100,000 for community coalitions that meet these criteria: have worked together on substance abuse prevention initiatives for a period of not less than 6 months; have as their principal mission the reduction of substance abuse; and have substantial participation from volunteer leaders in the community. Funding is provided for projects/programs to help increase citizen participation in community anti-drug coalition efforts to reduce youth substance abuse. Deadline: April 12. For information contact the ONDCP Clearinghouse. PH: 800/666-3332 (request SL 322). Or contact the OJJDP Clearinghouse. PH: 800/638-8736 (request SL 322).

**Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP):** The OJJDP has funding available for training and technical assistance related to violence prevention programs. For additional information contact, Betty Chemers, OJJDP. EMAIL: [bchemers@ojp.usdoj.gov](mailto:bchemers@ojp.usdoj.gov)

**Surdna Foundation:** The Surdna Foundation is providing approximately \$20 million to fund five program areas, including: community revitalization; effective citizenry, including conflict resolution; the environment; the arts; and the nonprofit sector. For additional information, contact: Edward Skloot, Executive Director, Surdna Foundation, 330 Madison Ave., 30th Floor, New York, NY 10017-5001. PH: 212/557-0010. EMAIL: [request@surdna.org](mailto:request@surdna.org)

**United Technologies Corporate Contributions:** Approximately \$7 million is available for human services programs primarily focused on substance abuse prevention and treatment, health education and higher education for selected states including Michigan. Grant deadline: June 1. For information, contact: United Technologies Corporate Contributions, 1 Financial Plaza, Hartford, CT 06101. PH: 860/728-7848.

### Grant writing consultation available from the SCAO

The SCAO will provide assistance to courts in identifying potential sources of funding for specific issues or consultation on grant-writing or grant proposals. If you have questions about any of the grants listed or need grant-related assistance, contact Margie Good, SCAO, at 517/373-5596.



# February

1	Friend of the Court Forms Committee SCAO, Lansing	20 & 21	MJI — Top Quality Customer Service Valley Plaza Resort, Midland
6	MJI — District Court: OUIL Marriott, Grand Rapids	21	Michigan Association of District Court Magistrates Executive Board Meeting Sheraton, Lansing
6 & 7	MJI — Top Quality Customer Service Sheraton Inn, Ann Arbor	22	JIS District Court Administrators Meeting SCAO, Lansing
14	MJI — Friend of the Court: Domestic Violence Seminar Sheraton Hotel, Lansing	23	Region III & IV Juvenile Registers Meeting Holiday Inn, Grayling
15	UP District Judges, Administrators & Clerks Days Inn, Escanaba	23	Region IV District Judges, Administrators & Clerks Meeting AREC Center, Gaylord
15	MJI — Probate Staff Specialty Seminar Holiday Inn, Big Rapids	23-24	CDRP Permanency Planning Mediator Training Holiday Inn, Grand Rapids
16	Region III & IV Probate Registers Meeting Holiday Inn, Grayling	26-30	MJI — Basic Counseling & Interview Techniques Seminar DNR Conference Center, Higgins Lake
16	Northern MI Juvenile Officers Conference Park Place, Traverse City	27	CIP Advisory Committee SCAO, Lansing
20	MJI — Probate Staff Specialty Seminar Sheraton Inn, Ann Arbor	28-29	MJI — Regional Judicial Seminar Park Place Hotel, Traverse City
20	Demonstration Project Advisory Group SCAO, Lansing		

# May

4 & 5	MJI — Top Quality Customer Service Holiday Inn, Mt Pleasant	17-19	MJI — Family Division: New Domestic Relations Mediators Comfort Inn, Mt. Pleasant
6-7	Michigan Association for Family Court Administration Conference Shanty Creek, Bellaire	18 & 19	MJI — Top Quality Customer Service Holiday Inn, Marquette
7	Circuit Court Support Staff Meeting Maxfields, Wyoming	19	Michigan Association of Circuit Court Administrators Meeting Holiday Inn, Petoskey
13	MJI — District Court: OUIL Park Place Hotel, Traverse City	19-21	Michigan Court Administrators Association Annual Conference Holiday Inn, Petoskey
13-14	MJI — Court Administrator Specialty Seminar Holiday Inn, Big Rapids	20	MPJA Executive Committee Meeting Grand Traverse Resort, Traverse City
14	MJI — Computers & Judges: Introduction Law MSU Detroit College of Law, East Lansing	21	MJI — Computers & Judges: Advanced Law MSU Detroit College of Law, East Lansing
		28	Referees Association Conference Waterfront Inn, Traverse City

Michigan  
Supreme  
Court

# REPORT

Michigan Supreme Court  
PO Box 30052  
Lansing, MI 48933  
Phone: 517/373-0129

BULK RATE  
US POSTAGE PAID  
LANSING, MI  
PERMIT NO. 1200